

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending and were rejected. Claim 6 has been cancelled herein. Reconsideration of the rejections of all pending claims is requested.

### I. Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-10 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as claims 1-24 of application US 2005/0110755. Because this is a provisional rejection, the applicants will address this rejection when either set of claims issue.

### II. Rejection of Claims 1-10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sherriff (GB 2,247,938) in view of Meyers (5,883,690).

#### CLAIM 1

Claim 1 is independent and is reprinted as follows for convenience:

A pointing device comprising:  
a puck sub-assembly comprising:  
    a moveable puck confined to move within a puck field of motion; and  
    a support member having an opening therein that determines a boundary for said puck field of motion;  
    **a first electrical contact;**  
a base sub-assembly comprising:

a base surface over which said puck moves; and

a position detector that measures the position of said puck in  
said puck field of motion;

**a second electrical contact that mates with said first  
contact for making an electrical connection between said  
support sub-assembly and said base sub-assembly; and**

an attachment mechanism for connecting said base sub-assembly to  
said puck sub-assembly such that said puck sub-assembly is reversibly  
separable from said base assembly, and said base surface is accessible  
when said puck sub-assembly is separated from said base assembly.

Some portions of claim 1 that are not disclosed by either Sherriff or Meyers have been printed above in bold type. The bold section of claim 1 consists of the elements of claim 6 that have been added to claim 1 via amendment herein.

According to the office action, Sherriff teaches the support sub-assembly having a first contact (31) that mates with a corresponding second contact (31) on the base sub-assembly. References is made to page 9, lines 21-25 of Sherriff.

According to this section of Sherriff, elements (31) are simply spring mounts that serve to return the puck to a central location. As stated, the spring mounts (31) serve to hold the springs (30) to the platter (22). There is no reference regarding any electrical contact via these springs (30) or the spring mounts (31). In addition, the springs disclosed by Sherriff only connect the puck to the upper assembly. There is no disclosure of the springs connecting to the base as claimed in claim 1.

The office action does not state that the aforementioned elements of claim 1 are disclosed by Meyer. Accordingly, neither Meyer nor Sherriff disclose all the elements of claim 1. Thus, they cannot render claim 1 obvious. Based on the foregoing, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

CLAIMS 2-10

Claims 2-10 are dependent on claim 1 and are deemed allowable by way of their dependence and for other reasons. Therefore, the applicants request reconsideration of the rejections.

In view of the above, all of the pending claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By: /Robert Nelson/  
Robert Nelson  
Registration No. 37,898  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, CO 80202  
(303) 298-9888